



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/094,991 06/15/98 GASPARRINI

C	EXAMINER-4126
---	---------------

MORGAN & FINNEGAN
345 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10154

IM52/0402

ART UNIT LAMB, B	PAPER NUMBER 9
---------------------	-------------------

DATE MAILED:
1734

04/02/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

89/094,991

Applicant(s)

Gasparini et al

Examiner

Lamb

Group Art Unit

1734

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/6/00
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 46 and 48-50 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 46 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 48-50 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1734

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanhikoski et al.

Hanhikoski et al teaches an apparatus for applying to a strip of material to a substrate which is comprised of a means for mounting a supply roll, a calendering means for reducing thickness of the strip and inherently increasing the length of the strip due to the known plasticity of paper webs, an applying means for applying a material to the strip and a means for forming a cleaning supply roll. If applicant disagrees that the pressure exerted by the calender stack on the

Art Unit: 1734

paper web/strip reduces thickness of the paper web/strip as well as inherently increases its length due to the known plasticity of paper, then applicant should do so on the record. Hanhikoski et al fails to teach the applying means applies a solvent that does not readily evaporate. However, it would have been obvious to modify Hanhikoski et al by substituting its applying means with an applying means for applying a liquid to a paper web/strip since the use of applying means to apply liquid such as a calender water box is also known in art also to moisturize a paper web/strip. If applicant disagrees that the use of water boxes on a calender stacks act in a manner which would increase the moisture of the paper web then he/she should do so on the record. Hanhikoski et al fails to end use of the apparatus for treating by soaking a cleaning fabric but it is noted that the material being treated is not structurally part of the apparatus. In any event, it would have been obvious the Hanhikoski et al apparatus is structured and arranged to treat a variety of types of paper substrates including those which would simulate a fabric absent a clear showing of unexpected results.

Applicant's argument with respect to claims 46 and 48-50 have been considered but deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claims 48-50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Brenda Adelt Lamb at telephone number (703) 308-2056.


BRENDA A. LAMB
PRIMARY EXAMINER